Dear Don, 5/16/97

We'll be glad to see you, I presume you mean over a weekend. The only one that is out is that of 6/14. Busy then,

I know nothing about any Shaw/New York investigation. Or about Schotz. There is no time now for all I could say about what you call hunches about Garrison. Briefly, that great tragedy was a complete fraud on the assassination, an uninhibited plagiarist who then improvised with nothing. I'll talk all you want about this and you'll be welcome to tape it, if you'd like that. But again that would be for you only. I'm so much more frail after those two hospitalizations for congestive heart failure. I want no controversies that I can avoid. And some of those people who are good and well-intended people are utterly lost in what they imagine based on believing him.

I found your first part very interesting with much I'd forgotten and much I did not know. I remember it in general, And Long. He was an interesting guy even as his enemies spoke of him. When I was in NO. the bus fare and the phones were still a nickel. People loved that.

I have some problems with part 2 and with some of your sources. I do not think Garrison is a dependable source, for example, and Di Eugenio I think aside from taking Garrison and not to be questioned imagines some if not much.

On page 3, about the middle, Riley should be Reily.

I am confident that Gaudet did not accompany Oswald to Mexico and I have no idea where DiE. got that (page 5). Gaudet was in the visa line in N.O.. next to Oswald.

On 6, there came a time when Catledge was editor of the Times-Picayune. I saw him then and he opened their morgue to me.

In General I think Shaw would have avoided many of those people. Not his kind. Ochsner and Butler were close but I've no knowledge that Butler and Shaw were. Or reason to believe they were.

On 17 I see no source for your saying that Tracy-Barnes was involved with the CRC, which was not "a far-right group." The others that the CIA forced into an alliance with the frente to form the CRC were far ~~rgith~~ right. Because the CRA wasn't Hunt quit the bay f pigs project. The CRC was formed just before the Bay of Pigs.

On the same page, I know of no reason to believe that "Bishop" was Oswald's "handler"-or that ther was one .

That the Sterns owned WDSU had nothing at all to do with LHO being on it.

Banister has but one n, here and elsewhere I know of no Shaw-Oswald connection of Shaw-Ferrie and do not think Shaw would have had anything to do

with Ferrie or was at all anti-JFK.

Any use of Garrison's books now is dangerous if one intends solid work and to be credited in the future. He lied often, misrepresented more oft en, and it was a shock to me to learn these things. What he did not crib and enlrage on he just made up out of nothing or next to it. Yet he refused to do the solid, reasonable things he could have done. And should have.

Meagher was corrrect. He was an Ayn Rand character. I continued to trust him long after I should not have. Long and painful story.

He astually had nothing on Shaw. Jim is quite wrong in saying that had the case not been thrown out Shaw would have been convicted of perjury. He may have been a perjurer but Garrison had no case of it. It was very obvious that garrison was bent on persecuting Shaw to try to clear his own name from his fiasco of his own making. That jury believe there had been a conspiracy but Garrison had no case at all. The jury took less than an hour to clear Shaw. That was quite an a indictment of Garrison.

I spent the Sunday before the day they started to empanel the jury with Al Oser and the other main lawyer in the case, I think Wardell, big as Garrison, and when we broke up and I'd heard any of the case for the first time I told them they'd lose, deserved to lose, and although I'd promised to sit at the counsel table with them as their "Dealey Plaza expert" I'd not do that and I didn't. I was never in the courtroom, never laid eyes on Shaw.

We hope you can make it.

Best,

Harold